

~~REF ID: A6512~~ *D. Morgan* *25 Aug 87*~~REF ID: A6512~~ PROJECT SUN STREAK (U)~~REF ID: A6512~~ CRV SESSION PROCEDURES REPORT*Therefore
no evaluation*

WARNING NOTICE: INTELLIGENCE SOURCES AND METHODS INVOLVED

CONTROL NUMBER: 8709

NICKNAME:

DATE OF SESSION: 24 Aug 87

TARGET COUNTRY: UR

REFERENCES: None

SESSION NUMBER: 05

DATE OF REPORT: 25 Aug 87

MISSION STATUS: Continuing

TECHNIQUE UTILIZED: CRV

SOURCE IDENTIFIER: 003

1. (S/NF/SK) INTERVIEWER TASKING: Tasking as listed in the previous sessions conducted with this Source on this project has not been changed or re-directed. This session was concerned with Phase II of the tasking package, the description of the characteristics and configuration of the Soviet prototype/counterpart to the US "Stealth" bomber. Other phases of the tasking package were not addressed in this session.

2. (S/NF/SK) SOURCE TASKING: Source was told this was a continuation of the last session and that He was to continue to focus His attention on the unusually configured aircraft that He reported on in His previous session. As the session progressed Source was tasked to locate, "another aircraft which may be similar to this aircraft but located in another global location". Source was further told to view this other aircraft, (#2) and to compare its capabilities and configuration to the first aircraft, (#1). Source was not provided any other cuing or descriptive data pertaining to either aircraft prior to this session.

3. (S/NF/SK) INCLEMENCIES: There were no unusual occurrences or anomalies which may have affected the data provided by the Source during this session.

4. (S/NF/SK) SUMMARY: Source furnished the attached summary which was prepared following the session and submitted to the Interviewer within 24 hours after the session. The completeness of the typewritten summary has been compared to the Interviewer's notes and all omissions, changes, and/or corrections have been verified as acceptable by the Interviewer. The information provided in the summary was found to be complete and did not require further

SECRET//NOFORN - SKEET CHANNELS ONLY

modification, clarification or additions by the Interviewer. Source did provide some very detailed post-session sketches which are attached to this report for reference purposes.

5. (S/NF/SK) COMMENTS: Source's data during this session continued to be the same high quality and of increasing clarity and interest. Until such time as technical data becomes available to this office pertaining to Stealth and/or the Soviet prototype, no hard conclusions can be made concerning the veracity of the information provided thus far. Some of the information such as wing configuration, the use of electric/optic remote servos, flight characteristics, etc., may offer the analyst the necessary confirmatory data to base a reasonable analysis of the remaining data. Until such time as directed otherwise, however, it is recommended that this Source be withdrawn from this project, at least as a temporary measure, to preclude the distinct possibility of an AOL Drive, "peacocking" or analytic labelling. In the future this Source could be called upon again to provide more specific data as required but for the time being the risk of compromising his future utilization in this project would seem to be in jeopardy.

SG1J

GS-13, DAC
Interviewer

~~SECRET - NOFORN~~
~~SECRET CHANNELS ONLY~~

(When filled in)

Page 1

Project: 8709
Date: 24 Aug 87
Session: 0105
Source: 003

Start: 1259
Sanctuary: —
Target: —
Finish: —

Coordinate: 137 500 / 112 794

Frontload:

Paul, begin by focusing your concentration on the high-tech plane you reported on during the last session. I'll provide you with additional tasking as we progress.

Notes:

- ①. No known or stated inclemencies.
- ②. Weather could not be better
- ③. Interviewer somewhat depressed - (Gon shipped out to Europe previous day). No big deal

~~SECRET - NOFORN~~
~~SECRET CHANNELS ONLY~~

(When filled in)

Dec 1987

(145)

Aircraft is flown in isolation--during off-hours, over isolated areas, with knowledge of pending flights kept close hold. Terrain overflown is somewhat hilly, with gullies and low vegetation and "chewed-up" ground. Area is reminiscent of some of the terrain around Boise, and also south-central Nevada. When aircraft flies, it's "like" the body or wing conformation is changed to enhance performance. There are a minimal amount of control surfaces; control linkages are non-standard "like" some sort of electro-optic connection, providing faster and more precise response. Purposes of the aircraft are intrusion, interdiction, penetration. It's not intended for a high-intensity combat environment against other aircraft. It carries missiles, perhaps exclusively; night may be its preferred operating time. Metallurgy involved is rather novel, involving laminates and metal bonding--"like" Teflon on a pan. Provides high strength, low weight, flexibility. The design sacrifices some maneuverability for other advantages: range, survivability, stability, low signatures. The two tails on this aircraft lean inward.

(Soviet)

Aircraft no. 2: Single tail slopes back, curved and recurved, with faint horizontal ridges. Smooth edges curving around. Wings larger, not as wide; body is "like" a slight hourglass shape--thicker, thinner, then thicker again, but gradually. Two engines are present, side-by-side. There are "stabilizing" ridges midwing on the top. Aircraft is "not as fancy" in design and construction. Performs in a "tighter envelope"--less forgiving of mishandling, its performance limits are generally lower, capabilities more limited; not as refined in manufacture, less attention to detail not directly function-related. The concepts of acceleration, interdiction, interception, and countermeasure seem relevant to no. 2. It's "like" an "antidote" of sorts for some thereat or perceived weakness in an overall defensive capability. No. 1 is almost "expected" to be sent abroad or deep into non-national territory to do its work. No. 2 could do such things but is out of preference kept closer to "home". No. 2 is more rigid, has more metal content in its manufacture. It was designed and developed with the same general intent as was no. 1, but the formula is different, and not as successful, but easier to make lots of. Signatures are greater, but still reduced significantly from normal. In some sense it's as if someone wanted to imitate or make a copy, but didn't have all the necessary plans or pieces of information. Intent was also to "improve on" original design, with the generally mistaken idea that bigger/faster/more numerous was "better." The concept of "signatures" seems to deal with words such as "cross section", "density", "reflective", "noise", "heat", "turbulence", "deflecting", and "magnetic". The idea is to reduce "presence signature"--things that make it easier to see or to stop. No. 1 practically disappears; no. 2 does also but leaves bigger trace.

Aircraft no. 2 is fueled by hose out of the ground on a concrete apron, apparently outside in the open. Aircraft no. 1 is refueled inside, from a hose on a spool; hose extends to outside. A truck pulls up outside; the person operating the truck has no idea what he's refueling--pumps it "right through

the wall". Aircraft no. 2 isn't as dark as no. 1--perhaps even some silver showing. Skin coating seems to be primarily on underbelly and leading edges. Provides economy and certain strength improvements at the sacrifice of small amount of increased signature.

FLIGHT

No. 1 flies low, NOE, terrain following and masking, relatively more maneuverable, acceptably fast, more airworthy, percent odds of accomplishing mission per aircraft is much higher.

No. 2 flies faster, higher, straighter, less maneuverable--not as successful in low, NOE type travel. Performance best rendered at higher speeds; makes it less precise in handling and performance. Requires more of them to assure high percentage chance of mission accomplishment. Counter-productive--more of them creates larger signature gestalt to be discovered. No. 2 is conservative in approach to a radical design which counteracts some of the advantages--older, known-to-be-reliable techniques applied to the aircraft blunt the advantages of newly developed technology. Example: steel cables instead of electronic links slow reaction time and accuracy of controls; conventional control surfaces; fuel metering less precise and controllable; fire control older, not as versatile or precise.

WEAKNESSES

No. 1: time consuming to produce. Complex. More can go wrong. Some systems barely out of experimental stage, unestablished track record--behavior under "field" conditions unknown. Can't defend itself very well. Lower top-end speed makes it difficult to escape a chase aircraft. Erosion of some sort is a hazard. Limited payload.

No. 2: insufficiently maneuverable--can't handle NOE flying well enough. Variety of situations it can deal with is limited. Significantly shorter range, greater signature; brittle construction. Larger than should be, and heavier. Not as airworthy. Speed capability is sometimes a liability, increasing tell-tale signatures. Unsophisticated avionics and weapons systems.

STRENGTHS

No. 1: Maneuverable. Can "hide" much more effectively. Systems designed redundantly enhance survivability. Avionics and weapons control guarantee greater margin of performance, reaction and success. Longer range. Quieter. Better made, more built-in capabilities. Some characteristics and capabilities still unknown to those outside.

No. 2: Faster; primary controls and systems have proven reliability. Many components already in production for other aircraft and systems and can be used, making it easier and cheaper to produce aircraft in quantity. Less skill required to train and to operate. Larger payload.

Paul
24 Aug 87
P. mead, ms
Genc
1254

52 D A2 B2 T I ~~AS~~ ^{AS}

more

AS

vegetant

curved

hard
green

smelle

1st. white
black
white

size when it flies its "like" it's got "long neck" - sticks out
more in front

canard

A2 BK
enjoyable
to watch

size practice it in isolation - off house, over isolated mead.
Times when used feet close hold. Area is somewhat hilly -
Gully, low vegetation cleared up ground. nearby woods.
Reminds me of some areas around Boise.

size "like" when flying body a wings conformation is changed
to "Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00789R000300580001-5"

II

T

I

HL HS

SD/2 minimal Control Surfaces. Non-standard Control 1.7 times faster & more precise response. "like" electro-optical connectors.

purpose
intrusions
avoidance
interdiction
penetration

SD/2 not intended for high intensity combat environment
missiles

few

night

SD/2 usually goes by itself or with one or two others widely separated.

HS - "like" "effezette of the air"

SD/2 metallurgy used is rather novel. Laminates & metal bonding - "like" Teflon and par. High strength low weight. Flexibility. Version gains free maneuverability for other advantages - range, survivability, stability, low signatures.

52

D Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00789R000300580001-5

301
me. 2

4
AS

white
grey
green
brown
yellow
red
black
silver

long
tailed

Stamps

Slanted

narrow

sharp

slanting

me. 1


5 1/2 - tails lean in

me. 2

5 1/2 single tail slopes back curved + rounded

black


ribbed



5 1/2 smooth edge curving around. wings larger, not as wide

42

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00789R000300580001-5




Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00789R000300580001-5

2 Aug 81
Werner 003

INTERVIEWER NOTES.

1. SINGLE TAIL Assembly
2. STABILIZING GROOVES/RIDGES
3. GENERAL HOUR GLASS shape



003
21 Aug 89

5 1/2 body - "like" bow glass shape - thick, thin, then
thick again - but gradually

Engines

2

Side by side

5 1/2 "Stabilizers" either mid-wing top
or tail fighter envelope. "Not as fancy"

2 1/2 Tolerance to approaching limits in flying conditions
not as great. Limits are lower. Performance
capabilities are more limited. Not as often
in manufacture, less attention to detail not directly
fancied up dated.

Acceleration
infadation
intake pt m
conformal

5 1/2 "like" - an antidote of sorts for some threat or perceived
weakness in an overall defensive capability,
No. 1 is almost "expected" to be sent abroad or deep into
non-national territory to do its work.
No. 2 ~~is~~ could do such things but is ~~is~~ out of preference
kept closer to "home."

5 VI

52

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00789R000300580001-5

A2

61

T

I

Als
ferro-
silicate

6

metalli

SiC's more rigid, more metal content - same intent as
Als but formula is different, + not as successful,
but easier to make lots of. Fuses larger, more power,
less range. Signature greater (but still reduced
from normal).

Als "Like" someone wanted to make a copy, but
better, but didn't have all the necessary plan.
wanted to imitate, but didn't have all the pieces - +
to "improve" on original design was to make it bigger
faster/more numerous.

Cross sect on
@

density

reflective

noise
heat
turbulence

deflecting

magnetic

SiC's idea is to reduce "presence signature" things that make

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00789R000300580001-5
~~other day disappears - No. 1 produces~~ games
~~big trace~~

52

SVI

D

A2

E2

T

I

for 2015

T

I

for BK
max of
So. Nevadakerosene
smallwarm
wetSub alft no. 2 is fueled by hose out of the ground on
cement apron.Alft no. 1 is inside. Hose on spool extends to
outside - tank truck or trailer. Its "like" - person divides
truck pulls up outside, has no idea about his fueling -
pumps it "right thru walls" ~~right thru walls~~no. 2 isn't as dark as no. 1 - maybe even some silver
showing. Skin coating primarily on underbelly
& leading edges. Economy & Strength improvement
gave it a small amount of increased signature.

Flight (c)

no. 1 - low, NOE, turn following & masking; relatively
more maneuverable, reasonably fast, more armament,
percent odds of accomplishing mission per
aircraft is much higher.no. 2 - faster, higher, straighter less maneuverable - not
as successful in low NOE type travel. Performance
less rendered at higher speed; makes less
precise in handling & performance. Requires more

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00789R000300580001-5

of them to assure high percentage chance of mission accomplishment. Counter production - money spent creates larger gestalt to discover.

10.2. Conservative in approach to radical design ~~rejects~~
considers some of advantages - older, more reliable
technologies applied blunt advantages of newly developed
technology. "Lift" - steel cables instead of electric
links slow reaction time of controls. Conventional
control surfaces. Paul Muttering less precise + controllable.
Fine control older, not as recent, less precise.

weaknesses (c)

No. 1 time consuming to produce. Complex. One cargo wrong. Some systems almost experimental, behavior under "fields" conditions unknown. Can't defend itself well. Lower top end speed make it difficult to escape a direct air vamp. Invasion of same sort is a hazard. ~~limited~~ payload.

No. 2. - In sufficiently maneuverable - can't handle no E flight well enough. Varieties of situations it can deal with is limited. ~~Significantly~~ significantly shorter range, greater signature; brittle construction. Larger than small be, + heavier. NOT as air-worthy. Speed capability is sometimes a liability by increasing tell-tale signatures. Unspecified avionics + weapons systems.

5 v. I

D A1

E3

Mr. H. S.

strengths (c)

No. 1 Unreliable. Can "hide" most most effectively, systems designed redundantly, entrance security, arms + weapons control, guaranteed greater margin of performance, reaction + success. Longer range. Dictates better made. must built for capabilities. Some characteristics + capabilities still unknown by others.

Others.

No. 2 faster, primary controls + system established
velocity). Many components already in production
can be used. Most easily + cheaply produced in
quantity. (eg still requires to ^{trade} operate larger
payload.

12409